arXiv:math/9308205v1 [math.FA] 10 Aug 1993

ON IMPOSSIBLE EXTENSIONS OF KRIVINE'S THEOREM

E. Odell and Th. Schlumprecht

Abstract. We give examples of two Banach spaces. One Banach space has no spreading model which contains ℓ_p $(1 \le p < \infty)$ or c_0. The other space has an unconditional basis for which ℓ_p $(1 \le p < \infty)$ and c_0 are block finitely represented in all block bases.

A famous theorem by J.L. Krivine [K] can be stated as

Theorem 0.1. *Let $C \ge 1$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists $m = m(C, n, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ so that if $(x_i)_{i=1}^m$ is a finite basic sequence in some Banach space with basis constant C then there exist $1 \le p \le \infty$ and a block basis $(y_i)_1^n$ of $(x_i)_1^m$ so that $(y_i)_1^n$ is $(1+\varepsilon)$-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_p^n.*

Actually this is a stronger version of Krivine's original theorem due to Lemberg [L] and H. Rosenthal [R] (see also [MS] for a nice exposition of the proof). Rosenthal also proved

Theorem 0.2. *Let (x_i) be a basic sequence in a Banach space. There exist a block basis (y_i) of (x_i) and a closed set $I \subseteq [1, \infty]$ such that if $p \in I$ and (z_i) is any block basis of (y_i), then ℓ_p is block finitely represented in (z_i).*

He raised

Problem 0.3. *Does $I = \{p\}$ for some p?*

We show in §2 that this is not the case. In our example $I = [1, \infty]$. In fact we construct an unconditional basic sequence (x_i) with the property that every 1-unconditional basic sequence is block finitely represented in every block basis of (x_i).

Research of E. Odell supported by NSF and TARP 235. Research of Th. Schlumprecht supported by NSF.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{S}$-TeX

The second problem we address involves spreading models. Not every infinite dimensional Banach space must contain c_0 or ℓ_p for some $1 \le p < \infty$ as shown by Tsirelson [T]. Krivine's theorem gives certain finite information about basic sequences. Between these two results lies the well known

Problem 0.4. *Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach space. Does X have c_0 or ℓ_p (for some $1 \le p < \infty$) as a spreading model?*

In §1 we exhibit a space X with an unconditional subsymmetric basis having the property that if Y is any spreading model of X then Y does not contain c_0 or ℓ_p $(1 \le p < \infty)$.

The original space of Tsirelson has c_0 as a spreading model and its dual space T as described by Figiel and Johnson [FJ] has ℓ_1 as spreading model. Numerous relatives of T have subsequently been defined (see [CS]) using variants of the clever implicit description of the norm due to Figiel and Johnson but fail to be a counterexample to Problem 0.4. The space S [S1,2] comes close but was shown by Pei-Kee Lin to have ℓ_1 as a spreading model (it is not known if S^* has c_0 as a spreading model).

Both of our examples are Tsirelson type spaces — spaces defined by an implicit Figiel-Johnson type norm equation — and involve modifying the norm of S. The example in §1 modifies S along the lines of W.T. Gowers' recent example [G]. It is unknown whether Gowers' space has ℓ_1 as a spreading model.

The theory of spreading models, which originated with the work of Brunel and Sucheston [BS1,2], is now fairly well established. For background information see [BL] (or [O] for a quick introduction).

Our terminology is standard as may be found in [LT]. If $A \subseteq X$ where X is a Banach space then span (A) is the linear span of A. $S(X)$ is the unit sphere of X and $Ba(X)$ is the unit ball of X. A basic sequence (x_i) is *block finitely represented* in (y_i) if for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a block basis $(z_i)_{i=1}^n$ of (y_i) satisfying

$$(1+\varepsilon)^{-1}\Big\|\sum_1^n a_i x_i\Big\| \le \Big\|\sum_1^n a_i z_i\Big\| \le (1+\varepsilon)\Big\|\sum_1^n a_i x_i\Big\|$$

for all $(a_i)_1^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. ℓ_p *is block finitely represented in* (y_i) if the unit vector basis of ℓ_p is block finitely represented in (y_i).

§1. A SPACE WITH NO SPREADING MODEL CONTAINING c_0 OR ℓ_p

Let c be the linear space of all finitely supported real valued functions on $\mathbb{N}$.

Let $f(i) = \log_2(1+i)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ we write $E < F$ if $\max E < \min F$. For $x \in c_{00}$ and $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, let $Ex \in c_{00}$ be given by $Ex(i) = x(i)$ if $i \in E$ and 0 otherwise. Fix an increasing sequence of integers (n_k) with

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{f(n_k)} < \tfrac{1}{10}\ . \tag{1.0}$$

Proposition 1.1. *There exists a* 1*-unconditional norm* $\|\cdot\|$ *on* c_{00} *which satisfies the implicit equation*

$$\|x\| = \max\bigg\{ \|x\|_{c_0}, \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|x\|_{n_k}^2\Big)^{1/2}\bigg\} \quad \textit{where} \tag{1.1}$$

$$\|x\|_k = \max_{E_1 < \cdots < E_k} \frac{1}{f(k)} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|E_i x\|\ . \tag{1.2}$$

Proof. We follow the standard Tsirelson norm construction of [FJ]. Let $\|x\|_{(0)} \equiv \|x\|_{c_0}$. If $\|x\|_{(k)}$ has been defined set

$$\|x\|_{(k+1)} = \max\bigg\{ \|x\|_{(k)}, \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|x\|_{(k,n_i)}^2\Big)^{1/2}\bigg\}$$

where

$$\|x\|_{(k,i)} = \max_{E_1 < \cdots < E_i} \frac{1}{f(i)} \sum_{j=1}^{i} \|E_j x\|_{(k)}$$

$\|\cdot\|_{(k)}$ is a norm for each k with $\|x\|_{(0)} \le \|x\|_{(1)} \le \cdots$ and all norms are dominated by $\|\cdot\|_{\ell_1}$. The latter fact can be seen from observing that $\|e_j\|_{(k)} = \|e_j\|_{(0)} = 1$ for all k, where (e_i) is the unit vector basis for c_{00}. The proposition follows by taking $\|x\| \equiv \lim_k \|x\|_{(k)}$. $\square$

We let X be the Banach space given by completing the space of Proposition 1.1. The unit vector basis (e_i) is a normalized 1-unconditional subsymmetric basis for X.

Proposition 1.2. *Let* (x_i) *be a normalized block basis of* (e_i) *with spreading model* (u_i)*. Let* $U = [(u_i)]$*. Then* ℓ_p *for* $1 < p < \infty$ *and* c_0 *are not block finitely representable in* (u_i)*.*

Proof. Let $1 < p < \infty$ (a similar argument works for c_0). If ℓ_p is block finitely representable in (u_i), then ℓ_p is block finitely representable in (x_i). But if $(y_j)_{j=1}^{n_i}$ is a normalized block basis of (e_i), then by (1.1)

$$\Big\|\sum^{n_i} y_j\Big\| \ge \Big\|\sum^{n_i} y_j\Big\|_{n_i} \ge \frac{1}{f(n_i)} n_i$$

which shows this to be impossible. $\square$

Thus by Krivine's theorem we need only show that such a U cannot contain ℓ_1.

Theorem 1.3. *Let (x_i) be a normalized block basis of (e_i) with spreading model (u_i). Then $U \equiv [(u_i)]$ does not contain ℓ_1.*

In particular X cannot contain ℓ_1 or c_0 and thus is reflexive.

Proof. We first prove that (u_i) cannot be equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1. If not then we may assume (by replacing (x_i) by a suitable bounded length block basis) that $\|x_i\|_{c_0} < 1$ for all i and for all $(c_i) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Big\|\sum c_i u_i\Big\| \geq (.99) \sum |c_i| \ .$$

This follows from James' proof that ℓ_1 is not distortable (see e.g., [BL], p.43).

For $i,k \in \mathbb{N}$ let $d_{i,k} = \|x_i\|_{n_k}$. Then $d_i \equiv (d_{i,k})_{k=1}^\infty \in S(\ell_2)$, the unit sphere of ℓ_2, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By passing to a subsequence of (x_i) we may assume that (d_i) converges weakly to $d \equiv (a_i) \in Ba(\ell_2)$ and

$$\lim_{\substack{\ell\to\infty\\ \ell<i_1<\cdots<i_n}} \Big\|\sum_{j=1}^n d_{i_j}\Big\|_{\ell_2} \quad \text{exists for all} \quad n \ .$$

Fix an integer $n \geq 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
.99n \leq \Big\|\sum_{i=1}^n u_i\Big\| &= \lim_{\substack{\ell\to\infty\\ \ell<i_1<\cdots<i_n}} \Big\|\sum_{j=1}^n x_{i_j}\Big\| \\
&= \lim_{\substack{\ell\to\infty\\ \ell<i_1<\cdots<i_n}} \bigg(\sum_{k=1}^\infty \Big\|\sum_{j=1}^n x_{i_j}\Big\|_{n_k}^2\bigg)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \lim_{\substack{\ell\to\infty\\ \ell<i_1<\cdots<i_n}} \bigg(\sum_{k=1}^\infty \Big(\sum_{j=1}^n d_{i_j,k}\Big)^2\bigg)^{1/2} \\
&= \lim_{\substack{\ell\to\infty\\ \ell<i_1<\cdots<i_n}} \Big\|\sum_{j=1}^n d_{i_j}\Big\|_{\ell_2} \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\|d\|^2 + \varepsilon^2 = 1$. Since $(d_i) \subseteq S(\ell_2)$ converges weakly to d, the latter limit above is

$$= (n^2\|d\|^2 + n\varepsilon^2)^{1/2} \ .$$

This can be seen by the standard gliding hump argument, choosing d_{i_j} essentially equal to $d + h_j$ where $\|h_j\| = \varepsilon$ and the "humps" (h_j) are disjointly supported in ℓ_2 and nearly disjoint from d. Thus $.99 \leq (\|d\|^2 + \varepsilon^2/n)^{1/2}$. Since n was arbitrary

i) $\|d\| \geq .99$ and hence since $\|d\|^2 + \varepsilon^2 = 1$, $\varepsilon < .15$.

Fix $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

ii) $\left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0} a_k^2\right)^{1/2} > .98$ and hence

iii) $\left(\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} a_k^2\right)^{1/2} \leq .2$

Since $(d_{i,k})_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty}$ converges weakly to $(a_k)_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty}$ in ℓ_2 and $\lim_{i\to\infty} \|(d_{i,k})_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} - (a_k)_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty}\|$

$= \varepsilon$, the analysis above yields (using iii)) that,

$$\lim_{\substack{\ell\to\infty \\ \ell<i_1<\cdots<i_n}} \left(\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} \Big\|\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{i_j}\Big\|_{n_k}^2\right)^{1/2} \leq \left(n^2(.2)^2 + n\varepsilon^2\right)^{1/2}$$
$$< .2\left(n^2+n\right)^{1/2} < .3n \ \text{ if } n \text{ is sufficiently large.}$$

Choose and fix N so that this holds and

iv) $2n_{k_0}^2 < .1N^2$.

Let $1 > \delta > 0$ be such that

v) $\sum_{k=1}^{k_0} (a_k + \delta)^2 < 2$.

Then choose $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_N$ so that

vi) $\left(\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} \Big\|\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{i_j}\Big\|_{n_k}^2\right)^{1/2} < .3N$,

vii) $\big|\, \|x_{i_j}\|_{n_k} - a_k\big| < \delta$ for $j \leq N$, $k \leq k_0$, and

viii) $\Big\|\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{i_j}\Big\| = \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Big\|\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{i_j}\Big\|_{n_k}^2\right)^{1/2} \geq .98N$

From viii) and vi) we obtain that

ix) $\left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0} \Big\|\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{i_j}\Big\|_{n_k}^2\right)^{1/2} \geq .9N.$

Let $k \leq k_0$ be fixed. Then

$$\Big\|\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{i_j}\Big\|_{n_k} = \frac{1}{f(n_k)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_k} \Big\|E_\ell\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{i_j}\Big)\Big\|$$

for some choice $E_1 < E_2 < \cdots < E_{n_k}$. Now if

$$I = \{j \leq N : E_\ell(x_{i_j}) \neq 0 \text{ for at least two different } \ell\text{'s}\}$$

then $|I| \le n_k$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{f(n_k)}\sum_{\ell=1}^{n_k}\Big\|E_\ell\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N}x_{i_j}\Big)\Big\| &\le \frac{1}{f(n_k)}\Bigg(\sum_{\ell=1}^{n_k}\Big(\sum_{j\in I}\|E_\ell x_{i_j}\| + \Big\|E_\ell\Big(\sum_{\substack{j=1\\ j\notin I}}^{N}x_{i_j}\Big)\Big\|\Big)\Bigg)\\
&\le \sum_{j\in I}\frac{1}{f(n_k)}\sum_{\ell=1}^{n_k}\|E_\ell x_{i_j}\| + \frac{1}{f(n_k)}\sum_{\substack{j=1\\ j\notin I}}^{N}\|x_{i_j}\|\\
&\le \sum_{j\in I}\|x_{i_j}\|_{n_k} + \frac{N}{f(n_k)}\\
&\le |I|(a_k+\delta) + \frac{N}{f(n_k)} \qquad \text{(by vii))}\\
&\le n_k(a_k+\delta) + \frac{N}{f(n_k)}\ .\end{aligned}$$

We thus obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{k_0}\Big\|\sum_{j=1}^{N}x_{i_j}\Big\|_{n_k}^2 &\le \sum_{k=1}^{k_0}\Big(n_k(a_k+\delta)+\frac{N}{f(n_k)}\Big)^2\\
&\le n_{k_0}^2\sum_{k=1}^{k_0}(a_k+\delta)^2 + 2n_{k_0}N\sum_{k=1}^{k_0}\frac{(a_k+\delta)}{f(n_k)} + N^2\sum_{k=1}^{k_0}\frac{1}{f(n_k)^2}\\
&< 2n_{k_0}^2 + 4n_{k_0}N(.1) + .1N^2\end{aligned}$$

by v), $|a_k+\delta| \le 2$ and (1.0). This in turn is by iv),

$$< 2n_{k_0}^2 + .5N^2 < .6N^2\ .$$

Thus

$$\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{k_0}\Big\|\sum_{j=1}^{N}x_{i_j}\Big\|_{n_k}^2\Big)^{1/2} < .8N$$

which contradicts ix).

We next show that U does not contain ℓ_1. By a diagonal argument and passing to a subsequence of (x_i) if necessary we may assume that (x_i) has a spreading model for each norm $\|\cdot\|_{n_k}$; i.e.,

$$\lim_{\substack{\ell\to\infty\\ \ell<i_1<\cdots<i_m}}\ \|\sum_{j=1}^{m}b_jx_{i_j}\|_{n_k} \text{ exists for all } (b_j)_1^m \subseteq \mathbb{R}\ .$$

Let $v_i = \sum_{j=m_i+1}^{m_{i+1}}b_ju_j$ be a normalized block basis of (u_i) with $\|\sum c_iv_i\| \ge .99\sum|c_i|$ for $(c_i)\subseteq\mathbb{R}$. Let $d_i = (d_{i,k})_{k=1}^{\infty} \in S(\ell_2)$ be defined by

$$d_{i,k} = \lim_{\ell\to\infty}\ \Big\|\sum^{m_{i+1}} b_ix_{i_j}\Big\|_{n_k}\ .$$

We may assume by passing to a subsequence of (v_i) that (d_i) converges weakly to $d \in Ba(\ell_2)$. In fact the entire argument above now carries over; $\|d\| \geq .99$ and d determines k_0 as before. This then defines N and δ and yields a contradiction. $\square$

Our work above suggests two natural problems. Let us say $E \to F$ if F is a spreading model of some basic sequence in E and $E \xrightarrow{n} F$ if $E \to E_1 \to \cdots \to E_n \to F$ for some sequence of Banach spaces $E_1, \dots, E_n$.

Problem 1.4. *Given $n \geq 2$ does there exist a Banach space E such that if $F = \ell_p$ $(1 \leq p < \infty)$ or c_0 then $E \overset{n}{\not\to} F$?*

Problem 1.5. *Does there exist a Banach space E such that for all n, $E \overset{n}{\not\to} F$ whenever $F = \ell_p$ $(1 \leq p < \infty)$ or c_0?*

§2

In this section we prove

Theorem 2.1. *There exists a 1-unconditional basic sequence (e_i) such that if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ is a finite 1-unconditional basic sequence, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $(y_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ is a block basis of (e_i) then there exists a finite block basis $(z_i)_{i=1}^n$ of (y_i) which is $(1+\varepsilon)$-equivalent to $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$.*

We first observe that it is not necessary to directly check all such sequences $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $B(\ell_\infty^n)$ denote the n^2-dimensional Banach space of all bounded linear operators on ℓ_∞^n. $B(\ell_\infty^n)$ has a matrix basis $(e_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^n$ given by $e_{i,j}(f_k) = f_j$ for $i = k$ and 0 otherwise (where $(f_k)_{k=1}^n$ is the unit vector basis of ℓ_∞^n).

It is routine to check that

$$\Big\| \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{i,j} e_{i,j} \Big\| = \max_{j \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{i,j}| \tag{2.1}$$

and thus $(e_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^n$ is a 1-unconditional basis for $B(\ell_\infty^n)$. We order this basis lexicographically: $(e_{11}, e_{12}, \dots, e_{1n}, e_{21}, e_{22}, \dots, e_{nn})$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $(y_k)_{k=1}^m$ be a 1-unconditional basic sequence for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a block basis $(x_k)_{k=1}^m$ of the basis $(e_{i,j})$ for $B(\ell_\infty^n)$ so that $(x_k)_{k=1}^m$ is $(1+\varepsilon)$-equivalent to $(y_k)_{k=1}^m$*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\mathrm{span}_{1\le i\le m}(y_i)$ is a subspace of ℓ_∞^n for some $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Write $y_k=\sum_{j=1}^n a_{k,j}f_j$ for $k\le m$ and define

$$x_k=\sum_{j=1}^n a_{k,j}e_{k,j}\ .$$

Let $(b_k)_{k=1}^m$ be scalars. Then from (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\sum_{k=1}^m b_kx_k\Big\| &= \Big\|\sum_{k=1}^m\sum_{j=1}^n b_ka_{k,j}e_{k,j}\Big\|\\ &= \max_{j\le n}\sum_{k=1}^m |b_ka_{k,j}|\ .\end{aligned}$$

Also using the 1-unconditionality of (y_k),

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\sum_{k=1}^m b_ky_k\Big\| &= \Big\|\sum_{k=1}^m\sum_{j=1}^n b_ka_{k,j}f_j\Big\|\\ &= \max_{j\le n}\sum_{k=1}^m |b_ka_{k,j}|\ . \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

Before proceeding we set some notation. For $t>0$, set, as in §1, $f(t)=\log_2(t+1)$. A finite sequence of pairs $((m_i,E_i))_{i=1}^k$, where $m_1<m_2<\cdots<m_k$ are integers in $\mathbb{N}$ and $E_1<\cdots<E_k$ are finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, is *admissible* if $m_1\ge 2$ and $f(m_{i+1})>\sum_{j=1}^i|E_j|$ for $1\le i<k$.

Proposition 2.3. *There is a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on c_{00} satisfying the following implicit equation.*

(2.2)

$$\|x\|=\max\Big\{\|x\|_\infty,\sup\Big\{\frac{1}{f(\ell)}\sum_{i=1}^\ell |||E_ix|||_{m_i}:\ell\in\mathbb{N}\ ,\ (m_i,E_i)_{i=1}^\ell \text{ is admissible}\Big\}\Big\}$$

where for $m\ge 2$, $|||\cdot|||_m$ is a norm on c_{00} given by

$$|||x|||_m=\sup\Big\{\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m\|F_ix\|:F_1<\cdots<F_m\Big\}\ . \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the Figiel-Johnson construction of the Tsirelson norm. We first inductively define for every $n\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ a norm $|\cdot|_n$ on c_{00}. Set $|x|_0=\|x\|_\infty=\max_{i\in\mathbb{N}}|x(i)|$. If $|\cdot|_n$ has been defined, given $m\in\mathbb{N}$ and $x\in c_{00}$, set

$$|x|_{(n,m)}=\sup\Big\{\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m|F_ix|_n:F_1<\cdots<F_m\Big\}\ .$$

Then set

$$|x|_{n+1} = \max\left\{ |x|_n, \sup\left\{ \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |E_i x|_{(n,m)} : (m_i, E_i)_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{ is admissible} \right\} \right\} .$$

Finally set $\|x\| = \max_k |x|_k$ and define $|\!|\!|x|\!|\!|_m$ by (2.3).

We check that this norm satisfies (2.2). Let $x \in c_{00}$ and let $((m_i, E_i))_{i=1}^{\ell}$ be admissible. For $1 \le i \le \ell$ let $F_1^i < F_2^i < \cdots < F_{m_i}^i$ be subsets of E_i. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \|F_j^i x\| &= \max_{k \ge 0} \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} |F_j^i x|_k \\ &\le \max_{k \ge 0} \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |E_i x|_{(k, m_i)} \\ &\le \max_{k \ge 0} |x|_k = \|x\| . \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|x\| \ge$ right side of (2.2). If $\|x\| = |x|_0 = \|x\|_\infty$ we have equality. Otherwise $\|x\| = |x|_k > |x|_{k-1}$ for some $k \ge 1$. Thus there exists an admissible collection $((m_i, E_i))_{i=1}^{\ell}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\| = |x|_k &= \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |E_i x|_{(k-1, m_i)} \\ &\le \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |\!|\!|E_i x|\!|\!|_{m_i} \le \text{ right side of (2.2).} \end{aligned}$$

□

Let X be the completion of c_{00} under the norm of (2.2). The unit vector basis (e_i) for c_{00} is a normalized 1-unconditional, 1-subsymmetric basis for X. Thus

$$\| \sum a_i e_i \| = \| \sum \varepsilon_i a_i e_{k_i} \|$$

whenever $\sum a_i e_i \in X$, $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$ and $k_1 < k_2 < \cdots$. Furthermore (2.2) and (2.3) hold for all $x \in X$.

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is quite technical and thus we first sketch the proof and give the intuition behind the argument.

It is not difficult to show that each block basis (y_i) of (e_i) which has the unit vector basis of c_0 block finitely represented must also have the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 block finitely represented (see the proof of step 1, below). Thus we deduce from this and Krivine's theorem that the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 is block finitely represented in (y_i) for some $1 \le p < \infty$ (step 1). We then choose, given $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $(x_i)_{i=1}^m$ where $x_i = n_i^{-1/p} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x_{i,j}$ is a rapidly increasing sequence of ℓ_p-averages in (y_i). This means that $(x_{11}, x_{12}, \dots, x_{1n_1}, x_{21}, \dots, x_{m,n_m})$ is a normalized block basis of (y_i), $(x_{i,j})_{j=1}^{n_i}$ is $1+\varepsilon$-equivalent to the unit vector basis of $\ell_p^{n_i}$ and the n_i's are rapidly increasing (n_1 is large and, $n_i = n_i(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j, p, \varepsilon)$). We deduce from step 4 below that $(x_i)_{i=1}^m$ is $(1+3\varepsilon)(1+\varepsilon)$-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_∞^m.

By the observation mentioned at the beginning of this sketch we deduce also that ℓ_1 is block finitely represented in (y_i). Thus we can find, given n, ε, a block basis $(x(i,j))_{i,j\le n}$ of (y_i) where $x(i,j) = \frac{1}{k_0} \sum_{s=1}^{k_0} x(i,j,s)$ and $(x(i,j,s))_{i,j,s}$ is a judiciously chosen block basis of (y_i) with $(x(i,j,s))_{i=1,\, s=1}^{n,\, k_0}$ $(1+\varepsilon)$-equivalent to the unit vector basis of $\ell_1^{nk_0}$ for $j \le n$. Finally we show $(x(i,j))_{i,j=1}^n$ is $(1+\varepsilon)$-equivalent to the basis $(e_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^n$ given by (2.1).

We first set some notation. Following [GM], for $1 \le p \le \infty$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C \ge 1$ we call x an *ℓ_p^n-average with constant C* if $x = n^{-1/p} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ where $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ is a normalized block basis of (e_i) which is C-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_p^n. Note that then $C^{-1} \le \|x\| \le C$. For $\ell, m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in X$, define

$$\|x\|_{(\ell,m_0)} = \sup\left\{ \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \|E_i x\|_{m_i} : m_1 \ge m_0 \text{ and } (m_i, E_i)_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{ is admissible} \right\} \text{ and} \tag{2.5}$$

$$\|x\|_\ell = \sup\left\{ \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \|E_i x\|_{m_i} : (m_i, E_i)_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{ is admissible} \right\} \equiv \|x\|_{(\ell,2)} \tag{2.6}$$

Remark 2.4. Thus $\|x\| = \max\{\|x\|_\infty, \sup_\ell \|x\|_\ell\}$. If $x \in c_{00}$ with $\|x\| \ne \|x\|_\infty$, then there exists $\ell > 1$ so that $\|x\| = \|x\|_\ell$. Indeed suppose $1 = \|x\| = \|x\|_1$. Then $\|x\| = \|x\|_m$ for some $m \ge 2$. Choose m maximal with this property. It follows that $x = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i$ where $(x_i)_1^m$ is a block basis of (e_i) and $\|x_i\| = \|x\| = 1$ for all $i \le m$. Since m was maximal, $\|x_1\|_k < 1$ for all k and so $\|x_1\|_\ell = 1$ for some $\ell > 1$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ be a block basis of (e_i) so that for each $i \le n$, x_i is an $\ell_1^{k_i}$-average with constant 2 for some $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $k_0 = \min\{k_i : 1 \le i \le n\}$. Then for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_i)_{i=1}^n \subseteq [-1,1]$,*

$$\Big\| \sum_1^n a_i x_i \Big\|_\ell \le \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \left[\Big\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \Big\| + 6\ell n k_0^{-1/2} \right]$$

Remark 2.6. An easy computation shows that Lemma 2.5 implies that if $\frac{f(\ell)-1}{\ell} > 12nk_0^{-1/2}$ then if $\|\sum_1^n a_i x_i\| = 1$,

$$\Big\|\sum_1^n a_i x_i\Big\|_\ell < \Big\|\sum_1^n a_i x_i\Big\| \ .$$

We postpone the proofs of Lemma 2.5 and the next lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $L_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 > \varepsilon > 0$. There exits $L_1, L_1' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $L_0 < L_1 < L_1'$ so that for any $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and any block basis (y_i) of (e_i) there is an $x \in \operatorname{span}(y_i)$ satisfying: $\|x\| = 1$ and*

- *a)* $\|x\|_\ell \le \frac{2}{f(\ell)}$ *if* $\ell \le L_0$.
- *b)* $\|x\|_{(L_1, m_0)} \ge 1 - \varepsilon$.
- *c)* $\|x\|_\ell \le \varepsilon$ *if* $\ell \ge L_1'$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let (y_i) be a block basis of (e_i), $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 > \varepsilon > 0$. By (2.1) and Proposition 2.2 it suffices to produce a block basis $(x(i,j))_{i,j=1}^n$ of (y_i) (ordered lexicographically) so that for all $(a_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$(1+\varepsilon)^{-1} \max_{j \le n} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{i,j}| \le \Big\| \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{i,j} x(i,j) \Big\| \le (1+\varepsilon) \max_{j \le n} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{i,j}| \ . \tag{2.7}$$

Choose $\delta > 0$ so that

$$(1+\varepsilon)^{-1} < (1-\delta)^2 \quad \text{and} \tag{2.8}$$

$$\delta < 3^{-1} \varepsilon n^{-2} \ . \tag{2.9}$$

Let $L_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$f(L_0) > \delta^{-1} \tag{2.10}$$

and choose $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $k_0 > \max(L_0, n)$ so that

$$k_0^{-1/2} < \frac{f(L_0) - 1}{12 n L_0} \ . \tag{2.11}$$

Choose $L_0' \in \mathbb{N}$, $L_0' > k_0$ so that

$$\frac{f(L_0')}{f(nk_0 L_0')} > 1 - \delta \ . \tag{2.12}$$

We then choose $L'_0 < L_1 < L'_1 < L_2 < L'_2 < \cdots < L_n < L'_n$ as follows. L_1 and L'_1 are chosen as in Lemma 2.7 for L_0 (of Lemma 2.7) $\equiv L'_0$ and $\varepsilon \equiv \delta$. If $L_r < L'_r$ are chosen, choose $L'_r < L_{r+1} < L'_{r+1}$ by Lemma 2.7 with $L_0 \equiv L'_r$ and $\varepsilon \equiv \delta$.

Choose now inductively, using Lemma 2.7, a lexicographically ordered normalized block basis $\{x(i,j,s) : 1 \le i,j \le n,\ s \le k_0\}$ of (y_i) along with integers $\{m_0(i,j,s) : i,j \le n,\ s \le k_0\}$ and an admissible family $\{m_t^{(i,j,s)} E_t^{(i,j,s)} : i,j \le n,$ $s \le k_0,\ 1 \le t \le L_j\}$ so that

$$\text{(2.13)}\quad m_0(1,1,1) = 1 \quad\text{and}\quad f\big(m_0(i,j,s)\big) > \sum_{(i',j',s')<(i,j,s)} \sum_{t=1}^{L'_j} |E_t^{(i',j',s')}| \ .$$

$$\text{(2.14)}\quad E_t^{(i,j,s)} < E_{t'}^{(i',j',s')} \quad\text{if}\quad (i,j,s,t) < (i',j',s',t') \ .$$

$$\text{(2.15)}\quad \|x(i,j,s)\|_\ell \le \frac{2}{f(\ell)} \quad\text{if}\quad \ell \le L'_{j-1} \ .$$

$$\text{(2.16)}\quad \|x(i,j,s)\|_{(L_j, m_0(i,j,s))} = \frac{1}{f(L_j)} \sum_{t=1}^{L_j} \|E_t^{(i,j,s)} x(i,j,s)\|_{m_t^{(i,j,s)}} \ge 1 - \delta \ .$$

$$\text{(2.17)}\quad \|x(i,j,s)\|_\ell \le \delta \quad\text{if}\quad \ell \ge L'_j \ .$$

The choice of L_1, L'_1 permits us to choose $x(1,1,1)$ satisfying (2.15)–(2.17) for $(i,j,s) = (1,1,1)$. Assuming that $x(i,j,s)$ has been chosen for all $(i,j,s) < (i_0,j_0,s_0) \le (n,n,k_0)$, let $m_0(i_0,j_0,s_0)$ be chosen as in (2.13) and choose $x(i_0,j_0,s_0)$, and an admissible family $(m_t^{(i_0,j_0,t_0)}, E_t^{(i_0,j_0,s_0)})_{t=1}^{L_j}$ by Lemma 2.7 to satisfy (2.14)–(2.17).

For $i,j \le n$ define

$$x(i,j) = \frac{1}{k_0} \sum_{s=1}^{k_0} x(i,j,s) \ . \tag{2.18}$$

Observe that for any $i \le n$, the family $(m_t^{(i,j,s)}, E_t^{(i,j,s)})$ is admissible (when ordered lexicographically, (i,j,s,t)) and so for $(a_i)_1^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

(2.19)
$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{s=1}^{k_0} x(i,j,s)\Big\| &\geq \Big\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{s=1}^{k_0} x(i,j,s)\Big\|_{L_j\cdot n\cdot k_0}\\ &\geq \frac{1}{f(L_j n k_0)} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{s=1}^{k_0}\sum_{t=1}^{L_j} |\!|\!| E_t^{(i,j,s)} x(i,j,s) |\!|\!|_{m_t^{(i,j,s)}}\\ &\geq \frac{f(L_j)}{f(L_j\cdot n\cdot k_0)} \sum_{i=1}^n \ \sum_{s=1}^{k_0} \|a_i x(i,j,s)\|_{(L_j, m_0^{(i,j,s)})} \ \text{(by (2.16))}\\ &\geq (1-\delta)^2 k_0 \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i| \ \ \text{(by (2.16) and (2.12))}\ .\end{aligned}$$

We conclude from (2.18) and (2.19) that for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, $(x(i,j))_{i=1}^n$ is $(1-\delta)^{-2}$-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1^n. By our choice of δ (2.8) we deduce the left hand inequality of (2.7).

To prove the right hand estimates let $(a(i,j))_{i,j\leq n} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $\|\sum_{i,j} a(i,j)x(i,j)\| = 1$ and let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. The argument of (2.19) yields that for fixed (i,j),

$$\Big\|\sum_{s=1}^{k_0} x(i,j,s)\Big\| \geq k_0(1-\delta)^2$$

and so each $x(i,j)$ is an $\ell_1^{k_0}$-average with constant $(1-\delta)^2$. Thus if $\ell \leq L_0$,

$$\Big\|\sum_{i,j=1}^n a(i,j)x(i,j)\Big\|_\ell < \Big\|\sum_{i,j=1}^n a(i,j)x(i,j)\Big\|$$

from Remark 2.6 and (2.11).

If $\ell > L_0$ then there is at most one $j_0 \leq n$ so that $\ell \in [L'_{j_0-1}+1, L'_{j_0}]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\sum_{\substack{i,j=1\\ j\neq j_0}}^n a(i,j)x(i,j)\Big\|_\ell &\leq \left[\frac{2n^2}{f(\ell)} + n^2\delta\right] \max\{|a(i,j)| : i,j\leq n\} \ \text{(by (2.15) and (2.17))}\\ &\leq 3n^2\delta \max\{|a(i,j)| : i,j \leq n\} \ \text{(by (2.10) and } \ell \geq L_0)\ .\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sum_{i,j=1}^n a(i,j)x(i,j)\Big\| &\leq \max_{j\leq n} \sum_{i=1}^n |a(i,j)| + 3n^2\delta \max\{|a(i,j)| : i,j\leq n\}\\ &\leq (1+\varepsilon)\max_{j\leq n}\sum_{i=1}^n |a(i,j)| \ \ \text{(by (2.9))}. \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

We turn now to the task of proving Lemmas 2.5 and 2.7. This requires several steps.

Step 1. *Let (y_i) be a block basis of (e_i). There exists $1 \leq p < \infty$ so that ℓ_p is block finitely represented in (y_i).*

Proof. By Krivine's theorem ℓ_p is block finitely represented in (y_i) for some $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Suppose $p = \infty$ (otherwise we are done). Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose a block basis (w_i) of (y_i) as follows. Let $w_1 \in \mathrm{span}(y_i)$ be an ℓ_∞^2-average with constant $1+\varepsilon$ and let $m_1 = 2$. If $w_1, \ldots, w_k$ are chosen, let $m_{k+1} \in \mathbb{N}$ with $f(m_{k+1}) \geq \sum_{j=1}^k |\mathrm{supp}(w)|$ and let w_{k+1} be an $\ell_\infty^{m_{k+1}}$-average of a normalized block basis in $\mathrm{span}(y_i)$ with constant $(1+\varepsilon)$ and, of course $w_k < w_{k+1}$. For any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(k_i) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, $(\mathrm{supp}(w_{k_i}), m_{k_i})_{i=1}^\ell$ is admissible and so

$$\Big\| \sum_{i=1}^\ell w_{k_i} \Big\| \geq \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^\ell |||w_{k_i}|||_{m_{k_i}} \geq \frac{\ell}{f(\ell)} \ .$$

Also $\|w_{k_i}\| \leq 1+\varepsilon$ for all i. We conclude from James' well known argument [J] that ℓ_1 is block finitely representable in (y_i). $\square$

Step 2. *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$, $k, m, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $x \in X$ be an ℓ_p^k-average with constant 2. Then*

a) $|||x|||_m \leq 4m^{-1/p} + k^{-1/p}$

b) $\|x\|_\ell \leq \frac{1}{f(\ell)}[C_p + 2\ell k^{-1/p}]$ *where* $C_p = \sum_{i=0}^\infty 4 \cdot 2^{-i/p} = 4(1-2^{-1/p})^{-1}$.

Proof. Let $x = k^{-1/p} \sum_{i=1}^k x_i$ where $(x_i)_{i=1}^k$ is a normalized block basis of (e_i) which is 2-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_p^k. Choose $E_1 < E_2 < \cdots < E_m$ so that $E_i \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(x)$ for $i \leq m$,[1] $|||x|||_m = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|E_i x\|$ and choose an admissible family $(m_i, E_i^\ell)_{i=1}^\ell$ so that $E_i^\ell \subseteq \mathrm{supp}\ x$ for $i \leq \ell$ and

$$\|x\|_\ell = \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^\ell |||E_i^\ell x|||_{m_i} \ .$$

For $i \leq k$, set $I_i = \{j \leq m : E_j \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(x_i)\}$ and $I_0 = \{j \leq m : j \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^k I_i\}$. For $j \in I_0$, let $k_j = \min\{i \leq k : \mathrm{supp}(x_i) \cap E_j \neq \emptyset\}$ and $K_j = \max\{i \leq k : \mathrm{supp}(x_i) \cap E_j \neq \emptyset\}$. Note that $|I_0| \leq \min(k,m)$. Similarly define $I_i^\ell, I_0^\ell, k_j^\ell$ and K_j^ℓ from the collection $(E_j^\ell)_{j=1}^\ell$ and note that $|I_0^\ell| \leq \min(k,\ell)$. Note also that $k_j < K_j \leq k_{j'}$ for $j < j' \in I_0$ and $k_j^\ell < K_j^\ell \leq k_{j'}^\ell$ for $j < j' \in I_0^\ell$.

---

[1] It may not be possible to insure that $E_i \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(x)$ (e.g., if $|\mathrm{supp}(x)| < m$) but this case

In order to prove a) we note first the following estimate.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j\in I_0} \|E_j x\| &\le k^{-1/p} \sum_{j\in I_0} \Big\| \sum_{i=k_j}^{K_j} x_i \Big\| \\
&\le 2k^{-1/p} \sum_{j\in I_0} (K_j - k_j + 1)^{1/p} \le 4k^{-1/p} \sum_{j\in I_0} (K_j - k_j)^{1/p} \\
&\le 4k^{-1/p} \Big[\sum_{j\in I_0} (K_j - k_j) \Big]^{1/p} |I_0|^{1/q} \quad \Big(\text{by Hölder's inequality with } \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1 \Big) \\
&\le 4|I_0|^{1/q} \quad \Big(\text{using } \sum_{j\in I_0} (K_j - k_j) \le k \Big) \\
&\le 4m^{1-1/p} \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Next let $i \le k$ with $I_i \ne \emptyset$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j\in I_i} \|E_j x\| &= |I_i| k^{-1/p} |I_i|^{-1} \sum_{j\in I_i} \|E_j x_i\| \\
&\le |I_i| k^{-1/p} |\!|\!| x_i |\!|\!|_{|I_i|} \\
&\le |I_i| k^{-1/p} \quad (\text{since } |\!|\!| x_i |\!|\!|_{|I_i|} \le \|x_i\| = 1) \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these two estimates we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\!|\!| x |\!|\!|_m &\le \frac{1}{m} \Big[4m^{1-1/p} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} |I_i| k^{-1/p} \Big] \\
&\le 4m^{-1/p} + k^{-1/p} \ , \text{ which proves a).}
\end{aligned}$$

Next we verify b).

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j\in I_0^\ell} |\!|\!| E_j^\ell x |\!|\!|_{m_j} &\le k^{-1/p} \sum_{j\in I_0^\ell} |\!|\!| \sum_{i=k_j^\ell}^{K_j^\ell} x_i |\!|\!|_{m_j} \\
&\le k^{-1/p} \sum_{j\in I_0^\ell} (K_j^\ell - k_j^\ell + 1)^{1/p} \big[4m_j^{-1/p} + (K_j^\ell - k_j^\ell + 1)^{-1/p} \big] \quad (\text{by a)}) \\
&\le \sum_{j\in I_0^\ell} 4m_j^{-1/p} + |I_0^\ell| k^{-1/p} \\
&\le C_p + \ell k^{-1/p} \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore for $i \le k$,

$$\sum_{j\in I_i^\ell} |\!|\!| E_j^\ell x |\!|\!|_{m_j} = k^{-1/p} \sum_{j\in I_i^\ell} |\!|\!| E_j x_i |\!|\!|_{m_j} \le k^{-1/p} |I_i^\ell| \ .$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^{k} |I_i^\ell| \le \ell$ we deduce that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |\!|\!| E_j^\ell x |\!|\!|_{m_j} \le C_p + 2\ell k^{-1/p}$$

which yields b). $\square$

Lemma 2.5 follows directly from the next step

Step 3. *Let* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \le p < \infty$ *and let* $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ *be a block basis of* (e_i) *consisting of* $\ell_p^{k_i}$*-averages with constant* 2 *for some* $(k_i)_1^n \subseteq \mathbb{N}$*. Let* $(m_i, E_i)_{i=1}^\ell$ *be an admissible family and* $(a_i)_{i=1}^n \subseteq [-1,1]$*. Let* $k_0 = \min\{k_i : i \le n\}$ *and let* $j_0 \le \ell$ *be maximal so that* $\sum_{j=1}^{j_0-1} |E_j| \le k_0^{1/2p}$*. Then for* $x = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i$*,*

$$\sum_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq j_0}}^{\ell} |||E_j x|||_{m_j} \le 6n\ell k_0^{-1/2p} \ .$$

Proof. Since $\|x\|_\infty \le k_0^{-1/p}$, by our choice of j_0,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{j_0-1} |||E_j x|||_{m_j} \le k_0^{1/2p} k_0^{-1/p} = k_0^{-1/2p} \ .$$

If $j_0 < \ell$ then

$$k_0^{1/2p} \le \sum_{j=1}^{j_0} |E_j| < m_{j_0+1} \le m_j \ \text{ for all } \ j \ge j_0 + 1 \ .$$

¿From Step 2 a) and this we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=j_0+1}^{\ell} |||E_j x|||_{m_j} &\le \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=j_0+1}^{\ell} |||x_i|||_{m_j} \\ &\le n\ell[k_0^{-1/p} + 4k_0^{-1/2p}] \\ &\le 5n\ell k_0^{-1/2p} \ .\end{aligned}$$

Step 3 follows immediately from these two estimates. ☐

The next step along with Step 1 yields that c_0 is block finitely represented in every block basis of (e_i) and hence, from the proof of Step 1, so is ℓ_1.

Step 4. *Let* $1 \le p < \infty$, $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{f(2)-1}{2}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *and let* $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$ *be a block basis of* (e_i) *consisting of* $\ell_p^{k_i}$*-averages with constant* $1+\varepsilon$*. Suppose, in addition, that*

$$f\left(\frac{\varepsilon k_1^{1/2p}}{6n}\right) \ge \frac{n(C_p+2)}{\varepsilon} \tag{2.20}$$

and for $2 \le i \le n$*,*

$$f(k_i) > \frac{p}{\varepsilon} \sum^{i-1} |\mathrm{supp}(y_s)| \ . \tag{2.21}$$

Let $y = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$. *Then*

a) $$\|y\|_\ell \le \frac{1}{f(\ell)}\big[\|y\| + \varepsilon\big] \quad \textit{if} \ \ \ell \le \frac{\varepsilon k_1^{1/2p}}{6n}$$

and

b) $$\|y\|_\ell \le 2\varepsilon + \max_{i\le n} \|y_i\|_\ell \quad \textit{if} \ \ \ell > \frac{\varepsilon k_1^{1/2p}}{6n}$$

In particular $\|y\| \le 2\varepsilon + \max_{i\le n}\|y_i\|$.

Proof. a) follows immediately from Step 3. Now suppose $\ell > \frac{\varepsilon k_1^{1/2p}}{6n}$. Let $(m_j, E_j)_{j=1}^\ell$ be an admissible family so that

$$\|y\|_\ell = \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{j=1}^\ell |\!|\!|E_j|\!|\!|_{m_j} \ .$$

Let $i_0 \ge 1$ be maximal so that

$$\sum_{s=1}^{i_0-1} |\mathrm{supp}(y_j)| \le \varepsilon\, f(\ell) \ .$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{j=1}^\ell |\!|\!|E_j\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} y_i\Big)|\!|\!|_{m_j} \le \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} |\mathrm{supp}(y_i)| \le \varepsilon \ . \tag{2.22}$$

Note also that if $i_0 < n$ then by (2.21),

$$\varepsilon\, f(\ell) \le \sum_{s=1}^{i_0} |\mathrm{supp}(y_s)| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{p} f(k_{i_0+1})$$

hence $\ell \le k_{i_0+1}^{1/p}$ and so $\ell k_i^{-1/p} < 1$ for $i > i_0$. Now from Step 2 b) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{j=1}^\ell |\!|\!|E_j\Big(\sum_{i=i_0+1}^{n} y_i\Big)|\!|\!|_{m_j} &\le \sum_{i=i_0+1}^n \|y_i\|_\ell \\ &\le \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=i_0+1}^n (C_p + 2\ell\, k_i^{-1/p}) \le \frac{n(C_p+2)}{f(\ell)} \\ &\le \frac{n(C_p+2)}{f(\varepsilon\, k_1^{1/2p}(6n)^{-1})} \le \varepsilon\ , \quad \text{(by (2.20)).} \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

Hence from (2.22) and (2.23),

$$\begin{aligned} \|y\|_\ell &\le \varepsilon + \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{j=1}^\ell |\!|\!|E_j y_{i_0}|\!|\!|_{m_j} + \varepsilon \\ &\le 2\varepsilon + \|y_{i_0}\|_\ell \ . \end{aligned}$$

To see the "in particular" statement we note that if $\|y\| = \|y\|_\ell$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ then $\|y\| = \|y\|_\ell$ for some $\ell \ge 2$ by Remark 2.4. If $2 \le \bar\ell \le \frac{\varepsilon k_1^{1/2p}}{6n}$ then since $\|y\| > \frac{1}{2}$, a) and $\varepsilon < \frac{f(2)-1}{2}$ yields that $\|y\|_{\bar\ell} < \|y\|$. Thus b) yields the assertion. $\square$

We have one final step before proving Lemma 2.7.

Step 5. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists $\delta = \delta(m, \varepsilon) > 0$ so that whenever $(z_i)_{i=1}^m$ is a block basis of (e_i) satisfying*

(A) *For each $i \le m$, $z_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} z(i,j)$, where $(z(i,j))_{j=1}^{n_i}$ is a block basis of (e_i) consisting of $\ell_1^{k(i,j)}$-averages with constant $1+\delta$ satisfying for $i \le m$,*

$$f\left(\frac{\delta k(i,1)^{1/2p)}}{6n_i}\right) > \frac{n_i(C_1+2)}{\delta} \tag{2.20$'$}$$

and

$$f\big(k(i,j)\big) > \frac{1}{\delta}\sum_{s=1}^{j-1} \left|\text{supp}\big(z(i,s)\big)\right| \ , \quad \textit{for} \ \ j \ge 2 \tag{2.21$'$}$$

(B) *$n_1 > \frac{m}{\delta}$ and $f(n_i) > \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |\text{supp } z_j|$ for $2 \le i \le m$.*

Then for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Big\|\sum_{i=1}^m z_i\Big\|_\ell \le (1+\varepsilon)\max\left\{1, \frac{m}{f(\ell)f(m/\min(\ell,m))}\right\}$$

and thus (since $f(xy) \le f(x)f(y)$ for $x, y \ge 1$, see e.g., [S1] *lemma 1)*

$$\Big\|\sum_{i=1}^m z_i\Big\|_\ell \le (1+\varepsilon)\frac{m}{f(m)} \ .$$

Proof of Lemma 2.7.

Let $\frac{1}{3} > \varepsilon > 0$, $L_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose $L_1 > L_0$ with $\frac{f(L_1)}{f(L_1/L_0)} \le 1+\varepsilon$ and $\frac{f(L_1)}{L_1} < \varepsilon/2$. Then take $L_1' > L_1$ with $\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}(\frac{f(L_1)}{L_1} + \frac{f(L_1)}{f(L_1')}) < \varepsilon$.

Let $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and let (y_i) be a block basis of (e_i). Let $(z_i)_{i=1}^{L_1}$ be a block basis of (y_i) which satisfies A) and B) of Step 5 for $\frac{\varepsilon}{L_1} \equiv \varepsilon'$ and $\delta = \delta(L_1, \varepsilon')$. We may also assume that $n_1 \ge m_0$. This can be done since ℓ_1 is block finitely represented in (y_i).

¿From Step 5 and the properties of f,

$$\Big\|\sum_{i=1}^{L_1} z_i\Big\| \le (1+\varepsilon')\sup_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{L_1}{f(\ell)f(L_1/\min(L_1,\ell))} \le \frac{(1+\varepsilon')L_1}{f(L_1)} \tag{2.24}$$

Set

$$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon'}\ \frac{f(L_1)}{L_1}\sum_{i=1}^{L_1} z_i \in Ba(X) \ \text{ and } \ x = \bar{x}/\|\bar{x}\| \ .$$

Using the notation of Step 5,

$$\begin{aligned}1 \geq \|\bar{x}\| \geq \|\bar{x}\|_{(L_1,m_0)}&\\ &\geq \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon'}\ \frac{f(L_1)}{L_1}\ \frac{1}{f(L_1)}\sum_{i=1}^{L_1} \|\!|z_i|\!\|_{n_i}\\ &\geq \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon'}\ \frac{1}{L_1}\sum_{i=1}^{L_1}\frac{1}{n_i}\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}\|z(i,j)\|\\ &\geq \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon'}\ \frac{1}{L_1}\sum_{i=1}^{L_1}\frac{1}{n_i}\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon'} = \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon')^2} > 1-\varepsilon\ .\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|x\|_{(L_1,m_0)} > 1-\varepsilon$ which proves b) of Lemma 2.7.

For $\ell \leq L_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{x}\|_\ell &\leq \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon'}\ \frac{f(L_1)}{L_1}\ \frac{L_1(1+\varepsilon')}{f(\ell)f(\frac{L_1}{\ell})}\quad \text{(by (2.24))}\\ &= \frac{f(L_1)}{f(\ell)f(\frac{L_1}{\ell})} \leq \frac{f(L_1)}{f(\ell)f(\frac{L_1}{L_0})} \leq \frac{1+\varepsilon}{f(\ell)}\quad \text{and so}\\ \|x\|_\ell &< \frac{1+\varepsilon}{f(\ell)}\ \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} < \frac{2}{f(\ell)}\quad \text{which proves a).}\end{aligned}$$

Finally if $\ell \geq L_1'$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{x}\|_\ell &\leq \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon'}\ \frac{f(L_1)}{L_1}(1+\varepsilon')\max\left\{1,\frac{L_1}{f(\ell)}\right\}\quad \text{(from Step 5)}\\ &\leq \frac{f(L_1)}{L_1}+\frac{f(L_1)}{f(\ell)} \leq \frac{f(L_1)}{L_1}+\frac{f(L_1)}{f(L_1')} < \varepsilon\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\|x\|_\ell < \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\left(\frac{f(L_1)}{L_1}+\frac{f(L_1)}{f(L_1')}\right) < \varepsilon$$

which proves c). ☐

Proof of Step 5.

We proceed by induction on m. Let $\frac{f(2)-1}{2} > \varepsilon > 0$. For $m=1$ the conclusion we desire becomes

$$\|z_1\|_\ell \leq 1+\varepsilon \text{ which holds by Step 4 if } \delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\ .$$

Assume Step 5 has been proved for all $1 \leq m' < m$. Let $\delta > 0$ be fixed small enough to satisfy the conclusion of Step 5 for all $m' < m$ and an $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ to be specified later, and let $(z_i)_1^m$ satisfy the hypothesis of Step 5.

Case 1: $\ell \geq \dfrac{\delta k(1,1)^{1/2}}{6n_1}$.

Our growth conditions imply that

$$\left(\frac{\delta k(i,1)^{1/2}}{6n_i}\right)$$

is an increasing sequence. Choose $i_0 \leq m$ to be maximal so that

$$\frac{\delta k(i_0,1)^{1/2}}{6n_{i_0}} \leq \ell\ .$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\ell) &\geq f\left(\frac{\delta k(i_0,1)^{1/2}}{6n_{i_0}}\right) \geq \frac{n_{i_0}}{\delta} \quad \text{(from (2.20)}') \\ &\geq \delta^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} |\mathrm{supp}(z_i)| \quad \text{(by B)} \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\Big\| \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} z_i \Big\|_\ell \leq \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} |\mathrm{supp}(z_i)| \leq \delta\ . \tag{2.25}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\| \sum_{i=i_0+1}^{m} z_i \Big\|_\ell &\leq \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{i=i_0+1}^{m} \big(\|z_i\| + \delta\big) \\ &\qquad \text{(from Step 4 a) since } \ell \leq \frac{\delta k(i,1)^{1/2}}{6n_i} \ \text{ for } \ i > i_0) \\ &\leq \frac{m}{f(\ell)}(1+3\delta) \leq \frac{m(1+3\delta)}{f(\frac{\delta k(1,1)^{1/2}}{6n_1})} \quad \text{(using } \|z_i\| < 1+2\delta \text{ from Step 4b)} \\ &\leq \frac{m(1+3\delta)}{n_1(C_1+2)}\delta \quad \text{(from (2.20)}') \leq \left(\frac{1+3\delta}{C_1+2}\right)\delta \\ &\leq \delta \quad \text{(provided } \ \delta \leq 1/2)\ . \end{aligned}$$

¿From this and (2.25) we have

$$\Big\| \sum_{i=1}^{m} z_i \Big\|_\ell \leq 2\delta + \|z_{i_0}\|_\ell \leq 1+4\delta\ . \tag{2.26}$$

Case 2: $\ell \leq \dfrac{\delta k(1,1)^{1/2}}{6n_1}$.

Let $(m_j, E_j)_{j=1}^{\ell}$ be an admissible family for which if $z = \sum_{i=1}^m z_i$, then

$$\|z\|_\ell = \frac{1}{f(\ell)} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |\!|\!| E_j z |\!|\!|_{m_j}\ .$$

For $1 \le i \le m$ let $j_i \le \ell$ be maximal so that $\sum_{j=1}^{j_i-1} |E_j| \le k(i,1)^{1/2}$.

It is possible that $j_s = j_t$ for some $t \ne s$. Let $\ell' \equiv |\{j_1, \dots, j_m\}|$ and relabel the set $\{E_{j_1}, E_{j_2}, \dots, E_{j_m}\}$ as $E'_1 < E'_2 < \cdots < E'_{\ell'}$. Choose intervals $I_i \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ so that $\bigcup_1^m I_i = [0, \max\ \mathrm{supp}(z)]$ and $\mathrm{supp}(z_i) \subseteq I_i$ for $i \le m$. Define for $s \le \ell'$,

$$\widetilde{E}_s \equiv E'_s \setminus \cup \{I_i : E_{j_i} \ne E'_s\}\ .$$

Note that for all $i \le m$, $\widetilde{E}_s \cap I_i \ne \emptyset$ for at most one s. Thus we can choose $0 = k_0 < k_1 < \cdots < k_{\ell'}$ so that $\widetilde{E}_s \subseteq \bigcup_{i=k_{s-1}+1}^{k_s} I_i$ for $s \le \ell'$. Note also that for $j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_m\}$, if $E'_s = E_j$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
|\!|\!| E_j z |\!|\!|_{m_j} &\le |\!|\!| \widetilde{E}_s z |\!|\!|_{m_j} + \sum_{\substack{i \le m \\ E_{j_i} \ne E'_s}} |\!|\!| E_j z_i |\!|\!|_{m_j} \\
&\le \|\widetilde{E}_s z\| + \sum_{\substack{i \le m \\ E_{j_i} \ne E'_s}} |\!|\!| E_j z_i |\!|\!|_{m_j}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} |\!|\!| E_j z |\!|\!|_{m_j} &= \sum_{j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_m\}} |\!|\!| E_j z |\!|\!|_{m_j} + \sum_{\substack{j \le \ell \\ j \notin \{j_1, \dots, j_m\}}} |\!|\!| E_j z |\!|\!|_{m_j} \\
&\le \sum_{s=1}^{\ell'} \|\widetilde{E}_s z\| + \sum_{j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_m\}} \sum_{\substack{i \le m \\ E_{j_i} \ne E_j}} |\!|\!| E_j z_i |\!|\!|_{m_j} + \sum_{\substack{j \le \ell \\ j \notin \{j_1, \dots, j_m\}}} |\!|\!| E_j z |\!|\!|_{m_j} \\
&\le \sum_{s=1}^{\ell'} \|\widetilde{E}_s z\| + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \Bigg(\sum_{\substack{j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_m\} \\ E_{j_i} \ne E_j}} |\!|\!| E_j z_i |\!|\!|_{m_j} + \sum_{\substack{j \le \ell \\ j \notin \{j_1, \dots, j_m\}}} |\!|\!| E_j z_i |\!|\!|_{m_j} \Bigg) \\
&\le \sum_{s=1}^{\ell'} \|\widetilde{E}_s z\| + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{j \le \ell \\ j \ne j_i}} |\!|\!| E_j z_i |\!|\!|_{m_j} \\
&\le \sum_{s=1}^{\ell'} \Bigg\| \sum_{i=k_{s-1}+1}^{k_s} z_i \Bigg\| + \sum_{i=1}^{m} 6 n_i \ell\, k(i,1)^{-1/2} \text{ (by Step 3)} \\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} \Bigg\| \sum_{i=k_{j-1}+1}^{k_j} z_i \Bigg\| + m\delta
\end{aligned}$$

(using that $6 n_i \ell\, k(i,1)^{-1/2} \le 6 n_i \ell\, k(1,1)^{-1/2} < \delta$ by Case 2).

If $\ell' = 1$ we deduce that

$$\|z\|_\ell \le \frac{\|z\| + m\delta}{f(\ell)}\ . \tag{2.27}$$

If $\ell' > 1$ since δ has been chosen smaller than $\delta(m', \varepsilon')$ for all $m' < m$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} \Big\| \sum_{i=k_{j-1}+1}^{k_j} z_i \Big\| &\le (1+\varepsilon') \sum_{j=1}^{\ell'} \frac{k_j - k_{j-1}}{f(k_j - k_{j-1})} \\ &\le (1+\varepsilon') \frac{m}{f(\frac{m}{\ell'})} \le (1+\varepsilon') \frac{m}{f(m/\min(m,\ell))} \ .\end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

The next to the last inequality above derives from the fact that the maximum of $g(a_1, \dots, a_{\ell'}) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{\ell'} \frac{a_i}{f(a_i)}$ on the set $\{(a_i)_1^{\ell'} : a_i \ge 1 \text{ and } \sum_1^{\ell'} a_i = m\}$ is achieved for $a_1 = \cdots = a_{\ell'} = \frac{m}{\ell'}$.

¿From (2.26), (2.27) and (2.28) we have

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \|z\| = \sup_\ell \|z\|_\ell &\le \max\left\{ 1 + 4\delta, \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1+\varepsilon'}{f(\ell)} \left[\frac{m}{f(m/\min(m,\ell))} + m\delta \right] \right\} \\ &\le (1+\varepsilon') \left[\frac{m}{f(m)} + m\delta \right] \ . \end{aligned} \right. \tag{2.29}$$

Thus, again using (2.26)–(2.28) and (2.29), and assuming $\varepsilon' < \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\|_\ell &\le \max\left\{ 1 + 4\delta, \frac{\|z\| + m\delta}{f(\ell)}, \frac{1+\varepsilon'}{f(\ell)} \left[\frac{m}{f(m/\min(m,\ell))} + m\delta \right] \right\} \\ &\le 4m\delta + \max\left\{ 1 + 4\delta, (1+\varepsilon') \frac{m}{f(m) f(\ell)}, (1+\varepsilon') \frac{m}{f(m/\min(m,\ell))} \right\} \ . \end{aligned}$$

Step 5 follows by taking ε' and δ sufficient small. $\square$

Remark 2.8. The authors have recently obtained a conditional version of the example in Section 2: a basic sequence (x_i) with the property that if (y_i) is any block basis of (x_i), $\varepsilon > 0$ and $(z_i)_1^n$ is a monotone basic sequence then there exists a block basis $(w_i)_1^n$ of (y_i) which is $(1+\varepsilon)$-equivalent to $(z_i)_1^n$.

REFERENCES

[BL] B. Beauzamy and J.-T. Lapresté, *Modèles étalés des espaces de Banach*, Travaux en Cours, Hermann, Paris, 1984.

[BS1] A. Brunel and L. Sucheston, *On J-convexity and some ergodic superproperties of Banach spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **204** (1975), 79–90.

[BS2] ———, *On B-convex Banach spaces*, Math. Systems Th. **7** (1974), 294–299.

[CS] P. G. Casazza and T. J. Shura, *Tsirelson's Space*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1363, Springer-Verlag, 1989.

[FJ] T. Figiel and W. B. Johnson, *A uniformly convex Banach space which contains no ℓ_p*, Comp. Math. **29** (1974), 179–190.

[G] W. T. Gowers, *A space not containing c_0, ℓ_1 or a reflexive subspace.*

[GM] W. T. Gowers and B. Maurey, *The unconditional basic sequence problem*, Journal of AMS (to appear).

[K] J. L. Krivine, *Sous espaces de dimension finie des espaces de Banach réticulés*, Ann. of Math. **104** (1976), 1–29.

[L] H. Lemberg, *Nouvelle démonstration d'un théorème de J.L. Krivine sur la finie représentation de ℓ_p dans un espace de Banach*, Israel J. Math. **39** (1981), 341–348.

[LT] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach Spaces, I*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977.

[MS] V. Milman and G. Schechtmann, *Asymptotic Theory of Finite Dimensional Normed Spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1200, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.

[O] E. Odell, *Applications of Ramsey theory to Banach space theory*, Notes in Banach Spaces, (H.E. Lacey, ed.), Univ. of Texas Press, 1980, pp. 379–404.

[R] H. Rosenthal, *On a theorem of Krivine concerning block finite representability of ℓ_p in general Banach spaces*, J. Func. Anal. **28** (1978), 197–225.

[S1] Th. Schlumprecht, *An arbitrarily distortable Banach space*, Israel J. Math. **76** (1991), 81–95.

[S2] ———, *A complementably minimal Banach space not containing c_0 or ℓ_p*.

[T] B. S. Tsirelson, *Not every Banach space contains ℓ_p or c_0*, Funct. Anal. Appl. **8** (1974), 138–141.

Department of Mathematics, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712-1082
E-mail address: `odell@math.utexas.edu`

Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843
E-mail address: `schlump@math.tamu.edu`